cates three incisor teeth with the root of a relatively large maxillary canine; but the region of the molar teeth is lost. There is also a posterior fragment of a skull, which makes known the bones of the palate and the base of the brain-case seen from above. Enough is shown to indicate Theriodont characters, but the animal appears to diverge from the Theriodonts towards the Dicynodont type. If the base of the skull belongs to the same individual as the snout, it indicates a head nearly $4\frac{1}{2}$ inches long.

The second specimen shows fourteen dorsal vertebræ, which occupy a length of $5\frac{1}{4}$ inches; each slightly exceeds $\frac{3}{10}$ inch in length, so that this animal, named *Herpetocheirus brachycnemus*, is similar in size to the fossil previously described.

The centrum is deeply biconcave. There is no indication of a capitular articulation for the ribs. The ribs are slender, and the longest are $2\frac{1}{2}$ inches in length. There is no trace of the transverse expansion seen in *Cynognathus*, although the ribs preserved indicate twenty dorsal vertebræ. The humerus is $1\frac{6}{10}$ inch long and is exposed on the superior aspect. It is distinguished from the type already described by wanting the tuberosity on its inner distal border, which has a convexly rounded contour. The radius is stronger than the ulna, but there is no indication of an olecranon process exposed. The ulna is no stouter than a rib. These bones are an inch long. The carpus shows one large bone below the radius; there is a smaller bone on its outer side which corresponds to the distal end of the ulna; but there is no trace of a third bone preserved, and there is only one central bone preserved. There are three phalanges in a digit. The femur is $1\frac{9}{20}$ inch long; its articular head appears to be small and hemispherical. There is a large internal trochanter extending down the shaft, which corresponds with the similarly placed ridge in the femur of Megalosaurs and other Saurischia.

The slender character of the ribs, which are different from those in known Theriodonts, suggests the possibility that these remains belong to a group distinct from both the Cynodontia and Gomphodontia.

A small badly preserved fragment of a skull found near to this fossil is described; but there appears to be no sufficient evidence for associating it with the other remains.—*From the Proceedings of the Royal Society.* (Communicated by the Author.)

Note on the Japanese Species of Cistelidæ *and* Melandryidæ.

The publication of the paper mentioned Ann. & Mag. Nat. Hist. ser. 6, vol. xiii. p. 483, with a plate of twelve figures, is unavoidably postponed until 1895.